

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

G.P., *et al.*,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

BEST BUY CO. INC., *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01892-JAD-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 26]

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend case management deadlines by 60 days.  
Docket No. 26.

A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). “The diligence obligation is ongoing.” *Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D. Ariz. 2012). The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire period of time already allowed. *See Muniz v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 731 F.Supp.2d 961, 967 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (quoting *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 607 (E.D. Cal. 1999)). Failure to provide such showings may result in denial of a stipulated request to extend the case management deadlines. *Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1178 (D. Nev. 2022).

A request to extend case management deadlines must provide a “statement specifying the discovery completed.” Local Rule 26-3. To allow the Court to make a proper determination of whether the parties have been diligent throughout the discovery period, this statement must include the dates on which all discovery occurred. Such information is absent here. *See* Docket No. 26 at 2. The Court ordered the parties to diligently conduct discovery, and specifically ordered that any

1 future requests to extend case management deadlines must include a robust showing to show that  
2 the governing standards are met. Docket No. 25 at 2. The parties' stipulation is devoid of any  
3 such showing.

4 Further, the stipulation seeks relief because Plaintiff's expert has become unreachable.  
5 Docket No. 26 at 3. The parties offer no explanation as to why Plaintiff's expert has any bearing  
6 on the rest of discovery that needs to be completed, such as other depositions. *See id.* at 2-3.  
7 Additionally, the parties seek relief to "allow enough time to explore the potential to mediate this  
8 matter once additional discovery has been completed." *Id.* at 3. The Court has previously ordered  
9 that it is not inclined to modify the case management schedule simply because settlement is being  
10 discussed. *See* Docket No. 25 at 2.

11 Accordingly, the stipulation to extend is **DENIED** without prejudice. Docket No. 26.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 7, 2025

14  
15   
16 Nancy J. Koppe  
17 United States Magistrate Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28